

HIGHWOOD GENERATING STATION

Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 The Proposed Action.....	1-1
1.2 Key Agency Roles, Responsibilities and Decisions	1-3
1.2.1 USDA Rural Development, Utilities Programs	1-3
1.2.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	1-3
1.2.3 Montana Department of Environmental Quality	1-3
1.2.4 Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation	1-4
1.2.5 Montana State Historic Preservation Office	1-5
1.2.6 Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks	1-5
1.3 NEPA and MEPA Processes.....	1-5
1.4 Purpose, Need for, and Benefit of the Action.....	1-6
1.4.1 Estimated Electric Loads of Cooperative Member Systems.....	1-9
1.4.1.1 Residential.....	1-9
1.4.1.2 Commercial and Industrial.....	1-11
1.4.2 Power Supply	1-12
1.4.2.1 Generating-Capacity Mix.....	1-12
1.4.2.2 Natural Gas Supply, Demand and Pricing ..	1-14
1.4.3 Load and Generating Capability	1-16
1.4.3.1 Growth in Generation to Serve Load Base .	1-16
1.4.3.2 Combined Base Load Generation and Power Purchase Option.....	1-16
1.4.4 Summary and Conclusion.....	1-20
1.5 Public Participation.....	1-21
1.5.1 Scoping Process	1-21
1.5.1.1 RD Scoping.....	1-21
1.5.1.2 DEQ Scoping	1-22
1.5.2 Forthcoming Opportunities for Public Participation.....	1-23
1.6 Issues Development	1-23
1.6.1 Key Issues	1-23
1.6.2 Issues Considered But Dismissed	1-27

2.0 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
2.1 Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Consideration.....	2-2
2.1.1 Power Purchase Agreements.....	2-2
2.1.2 Energy Conservation and Efficiency	2-4
2.1.3 Renewable Non-Combustible Energy Sources	2-6
2.1.3.1 Wind Energy	2-7
2.1.3.2 Solar Energy.....	2-13
2.1.3.3 Hydroelectricity	2-14
2.1.3.4 Geothermal Energy	2-16
2.1.4 Renewable Combustible Energy Sources	2-18
2.1.4.1 Biomass.....	2-18
2.1.4.2 Biogas	2-20
2.1.4.3 Municipal Solid Waste.....	2-22
2.1.5 Non-Renewable Combustible Energy Sources	2-24
2.1.5.1 Natural Gas Combined Cycle	2-24
2.1.5.2 Microturbines	2-27
2.1.5.3 Pulverized Coal.....	2-27
2.1.5.4 Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Coal	2-29
2.1.5.5 Oil	2-32
2.1.6 Other Coal-Fired Power Plant Sites.....	2-33
2.1.6.1 Decker	2-36
2.1.6.2 Hysham	2-37
2.1.6.3 Nelson Creek.....	2-38
2.1.7 Salem Site Alternatives Dismissed	2-39
2.1.7.1 Obtaining Potable Water From Other Sources.....	2-39
2.1.7.2 Discharging Wastewater into the Missouri River	2-40
2.1.7.3 Disposal of Sanitary Wastewater in Septic System.....	2-40
2.1.7.4 Alternate Railroad Spur Alignments.....	2-41
2.1.7.5 Hauling Ash to the High Plains Landfill....	2-41
2.1.8 Conclusion	2-42
2.2 Alternatives to be Assessed in Detail.....	2-45
2.2.1 No Action.....	2-45
2.2.2 Proposed Action: Highwood Generating Station – Salem Site	2-46
2.2.2.1 Construction.....	2-46
2.2.2.2 Operation.....	2-53
2.2.2.3 Wind Turbines	2-58
2.2.2.4 Connected Actions.....	2-66
2.2.3 Alternative Site – Industrial Park Site	2-67
2.2.4 Comparison of Alternatives	2-70
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1 Soils, Topography and Geology	3-1

3.1.1 Salem Site	3-2
3.1.2 Industrial Park Site.....	3-3
3.2 Water Resources	3-6
3.2.1 Missouri River	3-6
3.2.2 Wetlands and Floodplains.....	3-9
3.2.3 Listed Species Associated with Missouri River.....	3-9
3.2.4 Surface Water Quality.....	3-11
3.2.5 Water Rights	3-12
3.2.6 Groundwater	3-14
3.2.7 Water Utilities.....	3-17
3.2.8 Salem Site – Watersheds/Aquatic Features	3-17
3.2.9 Industrial Park Site – Watersheds/Aquatic Features	3-20
3.3 Air Quality	3-22
3.3.1 Local Meteorology.....	3-22
3.3.2 Terminology and Federal/State Regulation of Air Pollutants.....	3-23
3.3.3 Air Quality in Class II Areas	3-28
3.3.4 Air Quality in Class I Areas.....	3-31
3.3.5 Mercury in the Environment.....	3-35
3.3.6 Global Climate Change.....	3-44
3.4 Biological Resources	3-47
3.4.1 Introduction.....	3-47
3.4.2 Pre-Field Research.....	3-48
3.4.3 Field Inventory.....	3-49
3.4.4 Federally Listed Endangered or Threatened, and State Listed Species of Concern.....	3-56
3.5 Acoustic Environment	3-60
3.5.1 Noise Terminology	3-60
3.5.2 Noise Guidelines.....	3-62
3.5.3 Existing Acoustic Environment at Both Alternative Sites.....	3-64
3.6 Recreation	3-67
3.7 Cultural Resources	3-70
3.7.1 Cultural Resources Inventory	3-71
3.7.1.1 Prior Investigations	3-71
3.7.1.2 Inventory Methodology	3-72
3.7.2 Inventory Results	3-74
3.7.3 Traditional Cultural Properties	3-81
3.8 Visual Resources.....	3-82
3.8.1 Terminology and Methodology	3-82
3.8.2 Salem Site	3-85
3.8.3 Industrial Park Site.....	3-88
3.8.4 Transmission Line Interconnection Corridors	3-90
3.9 Transportation	3-93
3.9.1 Roads and Traffic.....	3-93
3.9.2 Airports	3-96

3.9.3 Rail.....	3-96
3.10 Farmland and Land Use.....	3-97
3.10.1 Farmland.....	3-97
3.10.2 Zoning.....	3-100
3.10.3 Salem Site.....	3-100
3.10.4 Industrial Park Site.....	3-101
3.11 Waste Management.....	3-101
3.12 Human Health and Safety.....	3-102
3.12.1 Cascade County and the City of Great Falls.....	3-102
3.12.2 Salem Site and Industrial Park Site.....	3-105
3.13 Socioeconomic Environment.....	3-105
3.13.1 Cascade County and City of Great Falls – A Brief History.....	3-105
3.13.2 Cascade County and City of Greats Falls – Demographic Data.....	3-108
3.13.3 Cascade County and City of Great Falls – Economic Data.....	3-110
3.14 Environmental Justice/Protection of Children.....	3-114
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2 Methodology.....	4-2
4.2.1 Definitions.....	4-5
4.2.2 EIS Significance Criteria.....	4-6
4.3 Soils, Topography, and Geology.....	4-8
4.3.1 No Action Alternative.....	4-8
4.3.2 Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-8
4.3.2.1 Construction.....	4-8
4.3.2.2 Operation.....	4-13
4.3.3 Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-14
4.3.3.1 Construction.....	4-14
4.3.3.2 Operation.....	4-14
4.3.4 Conclusion.....	4-15
4.3.5 Mitigation.....	4-16
4.4 Water Resources.....	4-16
4.4.1 No Action Alternative.....	4-16
4.4.2 Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-17
4.4.2.1 Construction.....	4-17
4.4.2.2 Operation.....	4-21
4.4.3 Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-25
4.4.3.1 Construction.....	4-25
4.4.3.2 Operation.....	4-26
4.4.4 Conclusion.....	4-27
4.4.5 Mitigation.....	4-28
4.5 Air Quality.....	4-28
4.5.1 No Action Alternative.....	4-28
4.5.2 Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-29

4.5.2.1	Construction.....	4-29
4.5.2.2	Operation.....	4-29
4.5.2.2.1	Emissions and Compliance with Regulatory Standards.....	4-29
4.5.2.2.2	Impacts on Air Quality in Class II Areas.....	4-37
4.5.2.2.3	Impacts on Air Quality in Class I Areas.....	4-45
4.5.2.2.4	Mercury Emissions.....	4-50
4.5.2.2.5	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	4-53
4.5.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-56
4.5.3.1	Construction.....	4-56
4.5.3.2	Operation.....	4-56
4.5.4	Conclusion.....	4-57
4.5.5	Mitigation.....	4-57
4.6	Biological Resources.....	4-58
4.6.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-58
4.6.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-58
4.6.2.1	Threatened and Endangered Species and State Species of Special Concern.....	4-59
4.6.2.2	Evaluation of Specific Preferred Alternative Components.....	4-61
4.6.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-65
4.6.4	Conclusion.....	4-66
4.6.5	Mitigation.....	4-67
4.7	Acoustic Environment.....	4-70
4.7.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-71
4.7.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-72
4.7.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-75
4.7.4	Conclusion.....	4-75
4.7.5	Mitigation.....	4-78
4.8	Recreation.....	4-78
4.8.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-78
4.8.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-78
4.8.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-79
4.8.4	Conclusion.....	4-79
4.8.5	Mitigation.....	4-80
4.9	Cultural Resources.....	4-81
4.9.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-81
4.9.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-81
4.9.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-84
4.9.4	Conclusion.....	4-84
4.9.5	Mitigation.....	4-85
4.10	Visual Resources.....	4-86
4.10.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-86
4.10.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-87
4.10.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-92

4.10.4	Conclusion	4-92
4.10.5	Mitigation.....	4-94
4.11	Transportation.....	4-95
4.11.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-95
4.11.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-96
4.11.2.1	Construction.....	4-96
4.11.2.2	Operation.....	4-97
4.11.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-98
4.11.3.1	Construction.....	4-98
4.11.3.2	Operation.....	4-99
4.11.4	Conclusion	4-99
4.11.5	Mitigation.....	4-100
4.12	Farmland and Land Use	4-100
4.12.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-100
4.12.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-100
4.12.2.1	Construction.....	4-101
4.12.2.2	Operation.....	4-104
4.12.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-105
4.12.3.1	Construction.....	4-105
4.12.3.2	Operation.....	4-106
4.12.4	Conclusion	4-106
4.12.5	Mitigation.....	4-108
4.13	Waste Management.....	4-108
4.13.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-108
4.13.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-108
4.13.2.1	Construction.....	4-109
4.13.2.2	Operation.....	4-109
4.13.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-114
4.13.3.1	Construction.....	4-114
4.13.3.2	Operation.....	4-114
4.13.4	Conclusion	4-114
4.13.5	Mitigation.....	4-115
4.14	Human Health and Safety	4-116
4.14.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-116
4.14.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-116
4.14.2.1	Construction.....	4-116
4.14.2.2	Operation.....	4-117
4.14.3	Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-118
4.14.3.1	Construction.....	4-118
4.14.3.2	Operation.....	4-119
4.14.4	Conclusion	4-119
4.14.5	Mitigation.....	4-120
4.15	Socioeconomic Environment	4-120
4.15.1	No Action Alternative.....	4-120
4.15.2	Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-122
4.15.2.1	Construction.....	4-122
4.15.2.2	Operation.....	4-123

4.15.3 Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-126
4.15.3.1 Construction.....	4-126
4.15.3.2 Operation.....	4-126
4.15.4 Conclusion	4-127
4.15.5 Mitigation.....	4-127
4.16 Environmental Justice / Protection of Children	4-128
4.16.1 No Action Alternative.....	4-128
4.16.2 Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	4-128
4.16.2.1 Construction.....	4-128
4.16.2.2 Operation.....	4-129
4.16.3 Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	4-129
4.16.3.1 Construction.....	4-129
4.16.3.2 Operation.....	4-129
4.16.4 Conclusion	4-130
4.16.5 Mitigation.....	4-131
4.17 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-131
4.18 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources	4-135
4.19 Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	4-137
5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	5-1
5.1 Introduction.....	5-1
5.2 Past, Present and “Reasonably Foreseeable” Future Actions.....	5-8
5.2.1 Past and Present Actions and Trends	5-8
5.2.2 Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions and Trends.....	5-12
5.3 No Action Alternative.....	5-15
5.4 Proposed Action – HGS at the Salem Site.....	5-15
5.5 Alternative Site – Industrial Park.....	5-20
6.0 REFERENCES CITED.....	6-1
7.0 LIST OF PREPARERS	7-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	A-1
Appendix B:	Glossary.....	B-1
Appendix C:	Relevant Federal and State Environmental Laws and Regulations.....	C-1
Appendix D:	List of Persons/Agencies Consulted.....	D-1
Appendix E:	Index of Terms.....	E-1
Appendix F:	Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation Resources Inventory	F-1

Appendix G: Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluation G-1
 Appendix H: Native American Presence in Cascade County and
 the Great Falls Area During the Historic Period..... H-1
 Appendix I: DEQ Supplementary Preliminary Determination on
 Air Quality Permit for HGS I-1
 Appendix J: Significance Criteria.....J-1
 Appendix K: Preliminary Cause-Effects-Questions Diagram K-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. SME’s Service Area in Montana..... 1-2
 Figure 1-2. Upcoming Capacity Deficit Faced by SME’s
 Cooperative Member Systems 1-9
 Figure 1-3. SME Cooperative Member System Requirements by
 Customer Classification Through 2015 1-13
 Figure 1-4. Comparative Cost/Equity Buy Options..... 1-19
 Figure 1-5. Open House Scoping Meeting in Great Falls Civic
 Center on October 13, 2004..... 1-22
 Figure 2-1. Summary of the Results of SME’s November 2003
 RFP 10-year Evaluation..... 2-2
 Figure 2-2. “How We Use Energy in Our Homes”- Educational
 Pie Chart on the *Energize Montana* Website 2-4
 Figure 2-3. The Role of Renewable Energy Consumption in the
 Nation’s Energy Supply, 2004..... 2-6
 Figure 2-4. Modern Wind Turbine at Judith Gap, Montana 2-7
 Figure 2-5. Installed Wind Generating Capacity by State, in MW,
 as of Jan. 2005 2-8
 Figure 2-6. Wind Farm on West Virginia’s Backbone Mountain,
 Visible from Blackwater Falls State Park..... 2-10
 Figure 2-7. Montana Wind Resources 2-12
 Figure 2-8. Solar Photovoltaic System 2-13
 Figure 2-9. Concentrating Solar Power (solar thermal trough) System
 in California’s Mojave Desert..... 2-13
 Figure 2-10. Bureau of Reclamation’s Hungry Horse Dam &
 Reservoir on the South Fork of the Flathead River 2-14
 Figure 2-11. One of PPL Montana’s Great Falls Dams that Generate
 Hydroelectricity along the Missouri River (Rainbow
 Dam at Rainbow Falls) 2-15
 Figure 2-12. CalEnergy Navy I Flash Power Plant at the Coso
 Geothermal Field in California (85 MW net capacity)..... 2-17
 Figure 2-13. MSW: Pile of Used Newspapers..... 2-22
 Figure 2-14. Major Elements of Natural Gas Combined Cycle System 2-26
 Figure 2-15. Diagram Depicting Components of a “Generic”
 Pulverized Coal Power Plant 2-28
 Figure 2-16. Gasification-based System Concepts 2-30
 Figure 2-17. Composite Map of Montana Depicting Features
 Relevant for Power Plant Development..... 2-34

Figure 2-18. Locations of Four Main Potential Sites in the Site
 Screening Study 2-35

Figure 2-19. Artist’s Renderings of a Coal-Fired Power Plant at the
 Four Candidate Locations 2-36

Figure 2-20. Looking West onto the Yellowstone River Near the
 Hysham Candidate Site..... 2-37

Figure 2-21. View of Salem Site Looking Toward Highwood Mtns. ... 2-47

Figure 2-22. Another View of the Salem Site..... 2-47

Figure 2-23. Vicinity Map of Highwood Generating Station 2-48

Figure 2-24. Preliminary Site Configuration of the HGS 2-49

Figure 2-25. Relative and Approximate Heights, Elevations and
 Sizes of the Main CFB Plant Features (Preliminary)..... 2-50

Figure 2-26. Morony Dam and Reservoir at Site of Proposed Water
 Intake Structure 2-51

Figure 2-27. CFB Process with Hydrated Ash Reinjection 2-54

Figure 2-28. 1.5 MW GE Wind Turbines at Judith Gap, Montana 2-58

Figure 2-29. Preliminary HGS Wind Turbine Site Plan 2-59

Figure 2-30. Graymont’s Indian Creek Lime Plant near Townsend..... 2-66

Figure 2-31. Preliminary Layout of the Industrial Park Site 2-68

Figure 2-32. View of the Industrial Park Site 2-69

Figure 2-33. View from the Industrial Park Site West Toward
 Suburban Subdivision North of Great Falls..... 2-69

Figure 3-1. Landscape of the Missouri River Canyon..... 3-1

Figure 3-2. Soils Map of the Salem Site 3-4

Figure 3-3. Soils Map of the Industrial Park Site 3-5

Figure 3-4. Missouri River Downstream of Great Falls 3-6

Figure 3-5. Black Eagle Falls Dam on the Missouri River..... 3-7

Figure 3-6. Missouri River Flow near Great Falls..... 3-8

Figure 3-7. DEQ-Designated Impaired and Threatened Waters
 near Great Falls 3-12

Figure 3-8. Geologic Cross-Section in Vicinity of the Salem Site 3-15

Figure 3-9. Kootenai Formation Groundwater Elevation Contours 3-15

Figure 3-10. Madison Limestone Groundwater Elevation Contours..... 3-16

Figure 3-11. Watersheds in the Project Area 3-18

Figure 3-12. Aquatic Features of the Salem Site and Environs..... 3-19

Figure 3-13. Aquatic Features of the Industrial Park Site and Environs 3-21

Figure 3-14. Great Falls NWS Station Wind Rose 3-23

Figure 3-15. Class I Area: Big Salmon Lake in Bob Marshall
 Wilderness Area..... 3-32

Figure 3-16. Federal Mandatory Class I Air Quality Areas Within
 250 Km of the Proposed SME CFB Power Plant 3-33

Figure 3-17. Class I Area: Glacier National Park’s St. Mary Lake
 with Wild Goose Island 3-34

Figure 3-18. The Global Mercury Cycle..... 3-36

Figure 3-19. Historic Mercury Concentrations from 160-m Ice Core in
 Upper Fremont Glacier, Wind River Range, Wyoming ... 3-37

Figure 3-20. Sources of Global Mercury Emissions..... 3-38

Figure 3-21. Pie Chart of U.S. and Utility Mercury Emissions
 Compared to Total Global Emissions 3-39

Figure 3-22. Declines in Anthropogenic U.S. Mercury Emissions
 Since 1990..... 3-39

Figure 3-23. Mercury Deposition in the U.S. (2001) by Source..... 3-40

Figure 3-24. Mercury Exposure Pathways..... 3-41

Figure 3-25. Average Global Temperature Trend from 1880 to 2000 .. 3-44

Figure 3-26. The Greenhouse Effect..... 3-45

Figure 3-27. Transmission Line Crossing of Incised Drainage 3-50

Figure 3-28. Proposed Raw Water Intake Route 3-53

Figure 3-29. Morony Reservoir at Site of Proposed Intake 3-53

Figure 3-30. Bald Eagle 3-57

Figure 3-31. Mule Deer..... 3-58

Figure 3-32. Measured 24-hour Ambient Noise Levels – Salem Site ... 3-66

Figure 3-33. Measured 24-hour Ambient Noise Levels –
 Industrial Park Site..... 3-66

Figure 3-34. Giant Springs State Park astride the Missouri River..... 3-67

Figure 3-35. Fishing the Missouri River from Giant Springs
 State Park near Great Falls..... 3-68

Figure 3-36. Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center 3-69

Figure 3-37. River Side Railroad State Park in Great Falls..... 3-69

Figure 3-38. Sign at Entrance to Lewis and Clark Expedition
 Portage Staging Area near Salem Site 3-70

Figure 3-39. Area of Potential Effect of the HGS at the Salem Site 3-75

Figure 3-40. View of the Great Falls Portage NHL, with Morony Dam
 in Center and Belt Creek Canyon in Distance 3-78

Figure 3-41. View toward East-Northeast of 242A262, the Historic
 Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad..... 3-78

Figure 3-42. Salem Site Looking South..... 3-86

Figure 3-43. Salem Site Looking North..... 3-86

Figure 3-44. Salem Site Looking East with Highwood Mountains
 Visible in Distance..... 3-87

Figure 3-45. Industrial Park Site Looking Northeast Toward IMC
 Malt Plant..... 3-88

Figure 3-46. Industrial Park Site Looking SE toward Great Falls..... 3-89

Figure 3-47. Industrial Park Site Looking North..... 3-89

Figure 3-48. Typical Landscape West of Salem Site..... 3-91

Figure 3-49. Representative Habitat and Landscape Along Proposed
 Route of Both Transmission Lines near Salem Site 3-91

Figure 3-50. Missouri River Downstream of Rainbow Falls; Existing
 Transmission Lines Visible Spanning River..... 3-92

Figure 3-51. 230 kV Transmission Lines Prominent in Scenery North
 of Missouri River and East of Great Falls Switchyard 3-92

Figure 3-52. Great Falls Switchyard from Lewis and Clark National
 Historic Trail Interpretive Center Parking Lot..... 3-93

Figure 3-53. Salem Road Looking South near HGS Site 3-95

Figure 3-54. Railroad Routes in Montana..... 3-97

Figure 3-55. Typical Agricultural Land Use near Proposed Sites 3-98
 Figure 3-56. Farmstead Northwest of Proposed Salem Site 3-100
 Figure 3-57. Environmental Health Concerns 3-103
 Figure 3-58. Great Falls, Montana today 3-106
 Figure 3-59. Minuteman III in its Silo 3-107
 Figure 3-60. Cascade County Courthouse in Great Falls 3-107
 Figure 3-61. Great Falls Labor Market and 30-mile (48 km)
 Radius Surrounding Area..... 3-113
 Figure 4-1. Preliminary Cause-Effects-Questions Diagram for
 Proposed Southern Montana Electric Generating Station .. 4-4
 Figure 4-2. Construction Schematic of Ash Waste Monofill 4-9
 Figure 4-3. Proposed Drainage Schematic for Salem Site..... 4-19
 Figure 4-4. HGS L_{dn} Noise Contours at Salem Site..... 4-73
 Figure 4-5. HGS L_{dn} Noise Contours at Industrial Park Site 4-76
 Figure 4-6. Artist’s Rendition of HGS within Great Falls NHL
 Looking East toward Highwood Mountains 4-83
 Figure 4-7. View of Open Landscape within NHL north of
 Proposed HGS, Looking North toward Missouri
 River, that would remain unaffected by Proposed Action 4-83
 Figure 4-8. View of Salem Site Looking South without HGS 4-87
 Figure 4-9. View of Salem Site Looking South with HGS..... 4-87
 Figure 4-10. Viewshed of the HGS at the Salem Site..... 4-89
 Figure 4-11. View Southeast toward Great Falls Portage NHL
 Depicting HGS and Other Landscape Features 4-90
 Figure 4-12. Simplified Rendition of View from Portage Staging
 Area south toward HGS 4-90
 Figure 4-13. December 2005 View from Great Falls Portage Staging
 Area looking south toward proposed HGS Site..... 4-91
 Figure 4-14. View from Great Falls Portage Staging Area looking
 north toward Confluence of Missouri R. & Belt Creek ... 4-91
 Figure 4-15. Viewshed of the SME Generating Plant at the
 Industrial Park Site..... 4-93
 Figure 5-1. Visibility Trends for Western U.S. Class I Visibility
 Areas, 1992-2001 5-10
 Figure 5-2. Missouri River – Annual Runoff at Sioux City, Iowa 5-12
 Figure 5-3. Average Flows of the Missouri River at Great Falls,
 1957-2005 5-18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1. SME’s Cooperative Member Systems Requirements:
 Peak Demand in MW, 2004-2018 1-7
 Table 1-2. SME System Energy Requirements by Customer
 Classification..... 1-17
 Table 2-1. SME System Investments in Energy Conservation..... 2-5
 Table 2-2. Electric Power Cost (\$/MWh) Projections for

Renewable, Non-Combustible Energy Resources	2-6
Table 2-3. Unadjusted and Adjusted Undeveloped Hydropower Capacity in Montana	2-16
Table 2-4. Electric Power Cost (\$/MWh) Projections for Renewable, Combustible Energy Resources	2-18
Table 2-5. Estimated Annual Air Emissions for a 250-MW Generating Station Using Biomass or Municipal Solid Waste.....	2-19
Table 2-6. Electric Power Cost Projections for Non-Renewable, Combustible Energy Resources	2-24
Table 2-7. Estimated Annual Air Emissions for a 250-MW Generating Station from Non-Renewable, Combustible Energy Sources.....	2-25
Table 2-8. Levelized Costs for New Utility Power Generation Plants in Montana	2-43
Table 2-9. Comparison of Alternative Power Generation Technologies in Meeting the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action.....	2-44
Table 2-10. Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for HGS	2-56
Table 2-11. Estimated Annual Emissions of Criteria Pollutants	2-56
Table 2-12. Wind Power Firming Cost.....	2-63
Table 2-13. Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives.....	2-71
Table 3-1. Water-Related Regulations.....	3-10
Table 3-2. Great Falls and Highwood Temperature and Precipitation Summary/Period of Record: 1971-2000	3-22
Table 3-3. General Sources and Health/Environmental Effects of Criteria Pollutants	3-27
Table 3-4. NAAQS, MAAQS, and PSD Increments	3-29
Table 3-5. Cascade County Monitoring Data	3-30
Table 3-6. Six Cascade County Major Industrial Emissions Sources ...	3-31
Table 3-7. Federal Class I Mandatory Class I Areas Considered.....	3-32
Table 3-8. PSD Class I Significance Levels and Increments.....	3-34
Table 3-9. Montana Species of Concern Recorded Within 10 Miles of Great Falls, MT.....	3-49
Table 3-10. Wildlife Species Observed During Project Area Surveys..	3-51
Table 3-11. Fish Species in Morony Reservoir; Gillnet Sampling 1992 to 2005 Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE)	3-54
Table 3-12. Noxious Weeds Seen During the Field Reconnaissance...	3-59
Table 3-13. Common Noise Levels and Their Effects on the Human Ear	3-60
Table 3-14. Recommended Land Use Noise Levels.....	3-61
Table 3-15. Summary of Railroad Noise Standards (40 CFR 201)	3-62
Table 3-16. Noise Level Limitations for Structures and Open Spaces – Great Falls Municipal Code.....	3-63
Table 3-17. Maximum Permissible Noise Levels for Motor Vehicles – Great Falls Municipal Code.....	3-63
Table 3-18. Measured Short-term Ambient Noise Levels at	

Salem and Industrial Park sites	3-65
Table 3-19. Long-term 24-hour Ambient Noise Levels at Salem and Industrial Park Sites	3-65
Table 3-20. Cultural Sites Documented Within SME’s Project Area ...	3-77
Table 3-21. BLM’s VRM Scenic Quality Inventory and Evaluation Chart	3-83
Table 3-22. VRM Scenic Quality Inventory and Evaluation Chart for Salem Site.....	3-87
Table 3-23. VRM Sensitivity Level Analysis for Salem Site.....	3-88
Table 3-24. VRM Scenic Quality Inventory and Evaluation Chart for Industrial Park Site	3-90
Table 3-25. VRM Sensitivity Level Analysis for Industrial Park Site ..	3-90
Table 3-26. LOS for General Two-Lane Highway Segments	3-94
Table 3-27. Cascade County Health Profile	3-104
Table 3-28. Cascade Count Population Growth, 1900-2000	3-108
Table 3-29. Socioeconomic Characteristics of State of Montana, Cascade County, and City of Great Falls.....	3-109
Table 3-30. Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics, Cascade County, 2000	3-110
Table 3-31. Major Employers in Great Falls	3-111
Table 3-32. Industry Annual Average Employment in Great Falls	3-112
Table 3-33. Average Annual Unemployment Rate for the Great Falls MSA vs. U.S. Unemployment Rate.....	3-113
Table 4-1. Criteria for Rating Impacts.....	4-7
Table 4-2. BACT Summary for CFB Boiler.....	4-33
Table 4-3. BACT Summary for Auxiliary Combustion Devices	4-36
Table 4-4. PSD Significant Emission Rates	4-38
Table 4-5. Class II Significant Impact Modeling Results.....	4-41
Table 4-6. Maximum Modeled Impacts Compared to Monitoring <i>de minimis</i> Levels	4-41
Table 4-7. SME NAAQS/MAAQS Compliance Demonstration	4-42
Table 4-8. Class II PSD Increment Compliance Demonstration	4-43
Table 4-9. Predicted Adverse Impacts on Class I Increments	4-46
Table 4-10. SME Preliminary Visibility Results	4-48
Table 4-11. SME Final Visibility Results (Refined Methodology).....	4-49
Table 4-12. Current and Projected Future Maximum Mercury Emissions from Coal-Fired Power Plants in Montana.....	4-52
Table 4-13. Summary of Direct Impact on Biological Resources	4-67
Table 4-14. Predicted Noise Levels at Nearby Receptors – Salem Site	4-74
Table 4-15. Predicted Noise Levels at Nearby Receptors – Industrial Park Site.....	4-77
Table 4-16. Impacts on Cultural Resources.....	4-84
Table 4-17. BLM VRM Visual Resource Contrast Rating Classifications	4-86
Table 5-1. Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts from No Action, Proposed Action, and/or Alternate Site Alternatives	5-3

Table 5-2. Summary of the Potential Long-term Cumulative
Impacts from the No Action Alternative 5-16

Table 5-3. Summary of the Potential Long-term Cumulative
Impacts to which the Proposed Action would
Contribute Incrementally 5-17

Table 5-4. Summary of the Potential Long-term Cumulative
Impacts to which the Alternative Site for SME’s Power
Plant would Contribute Incrementally 5-21